

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 334

July 27, 1995, 10:40 a.m.
Page S-10754 Temp. Record

RYAN WHITE REAUTHORIZATION (AIDS)/Funding Freeze

SUBJECT: Ryan White CARE Reauthorization Act of 1995 . . . S. 641. Helms amendment No. 1855.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 32-67

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 641, the Ryan White CARE Reauthorization Act of 1995, will authorize "such sums as may be necessary" through fiscal year (FY) 2000 for the Ryan White CARE Act.

The Helms amendment would limit the amounts authorized for each fiscal year through FY 2000 to the FY 1995 appropriated level (\$633 million).

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The attitude that is reflected in passing bills that authorize "such sums as necessary" has contributed to the size of the huge, \$4.9 trillion debt we have today. Writing blank checks for programs, meritorious or otherwise, is never a responsible policy. While authorization levels are not binding, they do provide guidance to appropriators, and as overall limits they are generally followed. We should not duck our responsibility to provide guidance. Authorization levels should be set. Accordingly, the Helms amendment would select a reasonable funding level of \$633 million for each of the next 5 fiscal years. That level is equal to the amount that was appropriated in fiscal year 1995. Without this funding freeze, it is estimated that spending on this program over the next 5 years will total nearly \$3.7 billion. With the Helms amendment, more than \$3.1 billion would still be expended. Considering that the Federal Government spends 36 times more per AIDS victim who dies than it does for each heart disease victim who dies, and considering that similar statistics hold true for all other major causes of death, we think that it is generous to propose keeping this program at its current high funding level. We do not think we should leave it open-ended, though, allowing for any size increase. We therefore urge acceptance of the Helms amendment.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

(See other side)

YEAS (32)			NAYS (67)			NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (31 or 58%)	Democrats (1 or 2%)		Republicans (22 or 42%)	Democrats (45 or 98%)		Republicans (1)	Democrats (0)
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Hollings	Abraham	Akaka	Inouye	Bennett- ²	
Bond	Inhofe		Campbell	Baucus	Johnston		
Brown	Kempthorne		Chafee	Biden	Kennedy		
Burns	Kyl		Cohen	Bingaman	Kerrey		
Coats	Lott		Coverdell	Boxer	Kerry		
Cochran	McCain		D'Amato	Bradley	Kohl		
Craig	McConnell		DeWine	Breaux	Lautenberg		
Dole	Nickles		Domenici	Bryan	Leahy		
Faircloth	Pressler		Gorton	Bumpers	Levin		
Frist	Roth		Hatch	Byrd	Lieberman		
Gramm	Santorum		Hatfield	Conrad	Mikulski		
Grams	Shelby		Jeffords	Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
Grassley	Simpson		Kassebaum	Dodd	Moynihan		
Gregg	Smith		Lugar	Dorgan	Murray		
Helms	Thomas		Mack	Exon	Nunn		
	Thompson		Murkowski	Feingold	Pell		
			Packwood	Feinstein	Pryor		
			Snowe	Ford	Reid		
			Specter	Glenn	Robb		
			Stevens	Graham	Rockefeller		
			Thurmond	Harkin	Sarbanes		
			Warner	Heflin	Simon		
					Wellstone		
						EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:	
						1—Official Business	
						2—Necessarily Absent	
						3—Illness	
						4—Other	
						SYMBOLS:	
						AY—Announced Yea	
						AN—Announced Nay	
						PY—Paired Yea	
						PN—Paired Nay	

A funding freeze makes little sense when the number of AIDS cases are increasing at 20 percent a year. Additionally, we think we can trust appropriators to be frugal. Therefore, we oppose the amendment.